DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 374 FL 017 356

AUTHOR Baird, Scott
TITLE LAGS and the "Southwest" Dialect of Texas English.
PUB DATE 28 Dec 87
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America (San Francisco, CA, December 27-30, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Atlases; *Geographic Distribution; Language Patterns; Language Variation; Linguistic Borrowing; *North American English; *Phonology; *Regional Dialects; Socioeconomic Status; *Spanish; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States; *Texas (San Antonio)

ABSTRACT

The "Southwest" dialect, previously isolated in San Antonio, Texas, has been isolated south of that area. Data were drawn from the Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States (LAGS) and interviews with ten lower-middle/upper-lower class informants. Seven communities were represented by seven female and three male English speakers (four monolingual Blacks, three monolingual Caucasians, and three bilingual Caucasians). Eight distinctively "southwest" phonological variables, discussed in previous research on the dialect, were found to exist in the speech of all ten informants. The distinctively Southwest vocabulary (Spanish-English blends) previously noted also exists. It is proposed that the Southwest dialect be considered a Spanish dialect as well as an English dialect. It is noted that while the LAGS field records were not designed to capture bilingual data, its protocols suggest means of analysis. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293374

LAGS and the 'Southwest' Dialect of Texas English

A paper presented at the joint meeting of
LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA and AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY

December 27-30, 1987
San Francisco, California

by
Scott Baird
Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Baird
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL017356

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LAGS and the ´Southwest´ Dialect of Texas English

Bagby Atwood (1956) predicted that a "Southwest" dialect of Texas English could be isolated in the southernmost part of the State. That "Southwest" dialect was one of three English dialects I was able to isolate in San Antonio--and reported upon in earlier research (1985). I am now ready to report on the existence of the "Southwest" dialect south of San Antonio. I draw upon the linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States (LAGS). The data obtained in interviews with ten "L" (lower-middle/upper-lower social status) informants are analyzed. Seven communities are represented by seven female and three male English speakers (four are Black, three monolingual Caucasians, and three bilingual Caucasians). Eight distinctively Southwest phonological variables, discussed in the Baird research, exist in the speech of all ten informants. The distinctively Southwest vocabulary (Spanish-English blends), discussed in the Atwood research, also exist. The argument that the ´Southwest´ dialect needs to be looked at in a bilingual setting--English language and Spanish language--receives special attention. The ´Southwest´ dialect may be considered a Spanish dialect as well as it can be considered an English one. While the LAGS field records were not designed to capture such bilingual data, their protocals give hints at how such data can be analyzed.

LAGS and the 'Southwest' Dialect of Texas English

1. Settlement History of Texas

Soon after Christopher Columbus' expedition in 1492, Spanish *conquistadors* (explorers) began fanning out across the New Territories. Within forty years the government of New Spain was established. The conquistadors not only grabbed huge hunks of this hemisphere for Spain, they planted their own language on this soil.

After land was claimed and *presidios* (forts), were established, the conquistadors were joined by *peninsulares,* Spanish citizens sent by the Spanish government to rule the new colonies. Next to the presidios, the peninsulares built *pueblos* (villages), and missions (Davidson & Batchelor, 76-83).

The presidios housed soldiers; the pueblos were inhabited by farmers and merchants; the missions by priests and Indians. In the social order that evolved in these New Spain settlements, the peninsulares ruled. Only the peninsulares could hold either government or Catholic Church office. Spanish speaking descendants of these peninsulares were Creoles. The Creoles, because of their birth in the New World, were not accorded the same status as their Spain-born parents. Eventually, when Creoles married Native Americans, their offspring formed a third level in the social hierarchy: the Mestizos. The Indians themselves constituted the lowest level in the social hierarachy. Considered to be loyal subjects of Spain, the Indians really lacked the status,

even, of citizenship.

One cannot condone the slave-like existence of these Indians; nor can one gloss over their huge mortality rates due to overwork, exploitation, and death caused by European diseases. Still, we can acknowledge their contribution to a Spanish-language culture that was to affect more people than the English-langage culture that was to arrive centures later. In the New World today, Spanish speakers outnumber English speaker 2.5 to 1 (Jones). Put another way: for every ten speakers of English, we can find twenty-five speakers of Spanish.

The Spanish-language culture that emerged received 'corn, tomato, chocolate, potato, pancho, canoe, tobacco, hurricane' from the Indians. The Spaniard introduced 'horse, cattle, pigs, goats, chicken.' With the peninsulares in control, the Spanish language became the means of communication through the social hierarchy: creole and soldier, mestizos, Indians. The merging culture, centered around the presidio-pueblo-mission settlements, reached all the way to the southern tip of South America. It reached all the way to Oregon, in the north. Geographic place names in the United States attest to the vastness and success of the well-organized Spanish colonization plan. Indian and Spanish cultures merged, giving us: 'California, Nevada, Arizona, Montana, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Tuscan, San Carlos, Santa Fe, El Paso, San Antonio.'

During all this time, Spain and France were fighting

over the territories to the east. The area of Louisiana was owned by France and Spain at different times--until 1803. The United States bought the Louisiana territories from France in 1803. After that time, the inhabitants of Texas (including San Antonio) had English speaking neighbors to the north and to the east. Officially, Spain did not allow any of these people to come into Texas. Spain's power, though, was weakening. Illegal immigration by English speakers was common. Mexico began fighting Spain in 1810--finally gaining its own independence in 1821 (Johnston, 5-6).

Mexico allowed Americans to come into Spanish-speaking Texas--as long as they agreed to become Mexican citizens and join the Catholic Church. The English speaking community grew large enough and cantakerous enough, however, to form its own Republic of Texas in 1836. Ten years later, Texas joined the United States of America.

This granting of statehood politically, at least, symbolized Texas' transition from the Spanish speaking, majority culture of the Americas to the English speaking, minority culture. Today, all of our southern border states, including Texas, are still caught in the ebb and flow of conflict between these two cultures. Economically and politically stronger, the English speaking culture cultivates its ties with the United States, with token recognition of the culture to the south. Historically older and with more than twice as many people involved, the Spanish speaking culture cultivates its ties with the Hispanic world, with a mixture of embracing and begrudging recognition of the

culture--and the power--to the north.

Five half of the ten largest incorporated cities (not to be confused with metropolitan areas) in the United States are located in the midst of this two-culture, two-language, tug of war. Two cities, Los Angeles and San Diego, are in California; three, Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio, are in Texas. San Antonio, alone, sits in the midst of Texas' Spanish-speaking culture.

Two hundred and sixty-nine years ago, in 1718, the Spanish Catholic Church founded its first official Spanish institution along the San Antonio River, in Texas. Unlike previous Latin American settlements, this time a mission was established first: the Mission San Antonio de Valero. Within a few years, a presidio was established. Soldier-settlers, a mixture of creoles and mestizos, protected the mission from hostile Indians. The same soldier-settlers cultivated the land. Even though the two communities--the mission and the presidio--were thriving, Spanish officials encouraged fifty-six Canary Islanders to establish a a second town. To encourage the Canary Islander to settle, they were given the title of 'hidalgo.' *Hidalgo* was a title somewhat akin to 'noble.' While not as prestigious as real 'Peninsulares,' Canary Islanders came to San Antonio with the same sense of purpose, and with the same backing of the rulers in Spain.

So in March of 1731, the city of San Antonio really consisted of three separate entities: the Mission with its large group of 'domesticated, loyal-subject' Indians, the Presidio community of about 350 people, and the newly

arrived, arrogant Canary Islanders.

By 1809 the three groups had more or less merged into four neighborhoods, or 'barrios.' Two fringe barrios, without self-governing structures, also existed. Within the next fifty years the settlement of San Antonio de Bexar had changed considerably from separate institutions "...inhabited by distinct human groups: Indians, Mexican soldier-settlers and Canary Islanders. By the early 1800's San Antonio was a Tejano [true mixture of anglo/mexican/Indian] community. The institutional and ethnic distinctions had faded, and the town had grown into an ethnically integrated, though socially stratified, community (Eckerman & McNutt, 8)." Today, San Antonio boasts a population of one million people. It is still ethnically integrated. It is still socially stratified --with the English-speaking culture, including the black community, economically and politically dominating the Spanish-speaking.

2.A Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States

In 1565, the Spaniards built a Presidio at St. Augustine, Florida. St. Augustine is the oldest European settlement in the United States. The first English-language settlement, Jamestown, was not established for another forty-two years. Relevent to our own research, St. Augustine is included in the research conducted by the Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States (LAGS). Of more relevance: San Antonio, in Texas, is also included in the LAGS data collection.

The Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States is one of eight American English-language atlases either available or

partially available for public scrutiny. The eight atlases were prepared in order to provide dialect information that would (1) show contemporary geographical distribution of English language differences and (2) be usable later for historical comparisons of these geographical differences.

Two of the atlases have been published in hardbound, atlas mapping, format: The Linguistic Atlas of New England (LANE) [Kurath, et. al., 1939-43] and the Linguistic Atlas of the Upper Midwest (LAUM) [Allen, 1973-76]. Five are in various stages of instrument preparation, field work collection, editing, and publication. These five are the Linguistic Atlas of the Middle and South Atlantic States (LAMSAS), the Linguistic Atlas of the North-Central States (LANCS), the Linguistic Atlas of Oklahoma (LAO), the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Northwest (LAPN), and the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Coast (LAPC) [Davis, 1983, p26.].

The eighth Atlas, the Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States, has been produced on microfiche [Pederson, 1981]. The condordance of basic materials has been published in microform [Pederson, 1986]. Several interim reports of the LAGS material have appeared in the American Dialect Society publication *American Speech* [Pederson, 1969, 1974a, 1974b, 1976, 1980, 1981]. And the Handbook has been published [Pederson, et al, 1986].

Preliminary research for LAGS began in 1968 at Emory University, Atlanta. In essence, the project has collected dialect information for the States that encompass the Gulf of

Mexico: Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. But information has also been included from parts of Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Arkansas.

What do exist a decade and a half after inception are 1,198 sheets of 96-frame microfiche containing virtually every piece of information researched and recorded. Included are 1000 protocols and their idiolect synopses, a table of informants, a manual for research, and a series of essays that report the course of research since 1968. The latter also report future plans for LAGS which have yet to appear on fiche or in print.

3. Atlas Criticisms

The first of the American atlases, the New England one, was published in a series of volumes between 1939 and 1943. Needless to say the linguists' understanding of language has grown considerably since the 1930's. One of the biggest changes brought about by this growth has been our increased ability to study social variation in language, not just geographical distribution of variation.

An entire hybrid academic discipline, in fact, consisting of sociologists and linguists, has grown enough to produce its own journals. Courses in this discipline, sociolinguistics, can be found in even undergraduate curricula. Serious attempts have been made to deify the methodology (or methodologies) of sociolinguistics to the point that the methodology (or methodologies) of the linguistic atlas-makers could be dismissed as being no longer relevant to civilized human beings. One of the best of these

attempts is that of Underwood [Underwood, 1976. See also Keyser, 1963].

Underwood rightly calls to task the atlas people for their interviewing techniques (and resultant singleness of style of elicited speech), their worksheets (and resultant Anglo Saxon bias toward outdated rural terminology), selection of informants (with another Anglo Saxon bias), and the tendency of atlas researchers to exaggerate the generalities of their findings.

Without a doubt, all four types of faults hinder the scope of the LAGS data and the handful of publications the LAGS researchers have produced so far. I am more amused than bothered by the generalities problem. The sociolinguists, as a group, do not seem to be particularly careful in narrowing the scope of their own findings--indicating that they are not taking that problem too seriously, either.

I am bothered by the English only, Anglo-Saxon, rural, single speech style (how-does-one-talk-to-a-young-professor-type) limitations found in LAGS, however. Underwood has done all of us all a service by articulating the limitations of the approach.

4. Conviction and Confusion.

The limitations, though, have proven to be a strength. One of the purposes of the English language atlases was to provide data for later historical comparisons. One cannot make those comparisons in Texas because atlas material of the 1930's is unavailable. Data from the 1970's now is. Perhaps my decade of living in Asia gives me a twisted concept of

time, but one or two hundred years from now the forty years difference between LANE and LAGS will be of no consequence. The English language vocabulary loss of the Anglo-Saxon rural terminology during that forty years will be noted. But that vocabulary is only a miniscule portion of the vocabulary obtained in these eight atlases. The pronunciation data, which I find has far more importance, has barely been analyzed (with an obvious exception being found in that excellent work by Kurath and McDavid [1961].

It takes, really, only a cursory glance at the contents of LAGS to realize the unlimited potential of the project. So far the corpus is a huge mass of raw data restricted to the limits of microfiche. In 1987, the Anglo-Saxon bias is a point of social embarrassment. In two hundred years, should the Anglo-Saxon population of the United States reach a minority status, the data would prove to be a social icon. In short, the data is restricted to an ethnic, rural, formal setting. The assumption behind the studies was that English was and always would be the single major language of the United States.

We sociolinguists, at least those who cut our eye-teeth on urban, black, speech, have shared that assumption. We even found our own ethnic, urban, informal, English language settings socially acceptable. So where is the logic of the ethnic bias argument?

Thus with a tip of the hat to my colleague, Gary Underwood, and a wary eye cast over my shoulder at that huge Spanish speaking culture around me, I stubbornly insist that

to proceed is noble.

At times I am motivated to proceed out of scholarly conviction. I find defenses of the continuation of linguistic atlas-making thought provoking--especially such defenses as those by Davis (1983), Malkiel (1984), Frazer (1987) and Viereck (1987). At times my motivation appears to be centered more on confusion. Theoretical linguists still pretend they can explain performance by studying competence. Dialectologists still pretend they can explain competence by studying performance. I personally have seen little progress from either side. The theoretical people still shy away from empirical data of any kind; the empirical people still question whether or not a structural dialectology is possible [Davis, 1983, p.133]. And I am beginning to wonder if all this renewed concern for English as the Official Language of the United States [Hayakawa; Simpson] is nothing more than the nervous behavior of any minority group, hanging on to its language in order to protect its culture [Fishman, 1970; 1985].

5. LAGS and Texas

In 1984 I reported on preliminary data relating the LAGS material to Texas speech [Baird, 1984]. Basically, the LAGS staff divided their field work into four "zones:" the Eastern, East Central, West Central, and Western. The Western Zone includes:"Arkansas, Louisiana north west of the lower Atchafalaya Delta, and East Texas,...[Pederson, et al, 1981, page 3]." For those of us who live in Texas (and have our own concept of where East Texas can be found) the LAGS

definition needs clarification. In order to understand the LAGS data, though, a little more detailed knowledge of Texas dialects is necessary.

The best argued explanation, I think, is the three-dialects-of-Texas concept envisioned by Gordon Wood in 1971 [Wood, p. 358]. Wood has East Texas speaking Gulf Southern, Northeast Texas speaking Mid Southern, and West and South Texas speaking Plains Southern.

Bagby Atwood in his earlier vocabulary study, envisioned four dialects [Atwood, 1962]. His data included the North Texas (Woods's Mid Southern) and the East Texas (Woods's Gulf Southern). But Atwood divided Woods's Plains Southern into two: a Central Texas and a Southwest Texas. Put another way, Atwood thought researchers should be able to find variation among the data collected from the (1) Dallas (2) Houston, (3) Austin, and (4) San Antonio areas.

I have spent the past decade-and-a-half studying the linguistic make-up of South Texas, beginning with San Antonio and working east towards Houston, south towards Laredo, west towards Eagle Pass, and north towards New Braunfels. In earlier publications I have documented the existence of three English language dialects in San Antonio--roughly collaborating Atwoods prediction of East, Central, and Southwest dialects [Baird, 1985]--and I have documented the assimilation of German into English, in the New Braunfels area [Baird & Duncan, 1985].

English, itself, is close to being a minority language, in South Texas--if we use population of native speakers as

criterion. Anglo-Saxon, formal English--the type elicited in Atlas research is definitely a minority speech form. Yet it is a language, and a viable one. The LAGS data data now can show us that Atwood was correct: the Southwest Dialect of Texas does exist. My own limitation of the dialect to San Antonio can now be suspended. The dialect is widespread.

6. The "Southwest" Dialect of South Texas.

The geographic area that the LAGS data defines as "Lower Texas" begins with Austin in the north and works south to the border with Mexico. Austin--as separate research by Atwood [1962] and by Wood [1971] indicate--encorporates a dialect different than San Antonio. Nonetheless, the LAGS Lower Texas data include Austin informants in their interviews with 43 informants. I was particularly curious about the speech of the lower-middle and upper-lower speakers. None were interviewed in Austin, so my own preference for speakers eliminated the need to confront the Central Texas versus Southwest Texas dialect problem.

The Mexican-American population appears to be the majority in South Texas. The since the Mexican-American population also represents the economically and educationally disadvantaged. I chose, therefore, to analyze the LAGS data that I intuitively thought would represent most accurately the speech of Mexican-Americans.

Of the 43 Lower Texas informants, 10 were "L" (lower-middle/upper-lower social status). The informants come from seven communities: San Antonio (the farthest north), Brownsville (the farthest south), Laredo and San Ygnacio

(inland, but along the Mexican border), Bay City (along the Coast, near Houston), and Caney and Victoria (coastal towns between Houston and Brownsville). Four of the informants are monolingual Black; three are monolingual Caucasian; three are bilingual Caucasian. Seven of the informants are female; three are male.

While three of the informants stayed with the entire 109 page interview, two of the informants only lasted two hours. (both were bilingual speakers.)

The ten informants answered 90 questions in common. I selected 33 for analysis. All ten questions that were included on the LAGS staff's 'short list' were selected first. Six questions were on the Wood [1971] and Atwood [1962] vocabulary lists for "Plains Southern" and "Southwest" dialects. 20 questions (some overlapping with the vocabulary questions] contained phonological variables I had found important for the Southwest dialect of San Antonio [Baird, 1985]. Two were included for my own curiosity: pronunciations of 'grease,' and 'greasy.'

6.1 LAGS 'short list'

Seven of the ten "short list" questions elicit common responses from the ten informants. All of them pronounce the plural marker -s as [z] on years, in "(three) years old." All of them refer to vehicle for common transportation as a "car"; only one volunteered "auto" as an alternative. All of them refer to the bed coverlet, used for warmth, as a "quilt". (Two of them gave as alternatives Atwood's predicted alternative South Texas usage of "comforter," one

used the predicted alternative "comfort" [Atwood, 47].) All ten used "used to" and "used to be" as sentence qualifiers--in sentences like, "She isn't afraid now, but she used to (be)" [LAGS worksheet, p. 165].

The eight informants who had a term for putting beads on a string (question 28.4) all used "stringing beads." Eight referred to their sons and daughters (or themselves as siblings) as "children"; one as "kids" (with five of the "children" speakers recognizing "kids" as a viable alternative); and one as "youngsters." Seven referred to the cloth or rag used for washing dishes as a "dish rag"; two called it a "dish cloth"; one a "sponge" or "piece of cloth." All five who knew of the existence of a large pillow, wide as a bed, referred to it as a "bolster."

The only fuzziness on the short questions were found in two questions relating to grammatical phrases, "was not" and "all the way across." The former gave ranges from [wɑz nɑ̈t] to [ʊzn]. The latter gave five "all the way across"; two "plumb across"; one "all up the way across"; one "clear across"; and two refusals to answer the query.

6.2 Atwood and Wood Vocabulary items

Basically, the 'short list' established a commonality among the ten speakers. The next task was to ascertain if the commonality would develop into a dialect unique in Texas. It did.

Atwood lists eleven vocabulary items he considers important for an articulation of the Southwestern dialect (98). At another time, when discussing the possibility of a

Spanish-based South Texas influence on vocabulary, he lists seven more items (83). The ten informants in our study all discuss six of these sixteen items: 'picket fence, bedspread, crocker sack, (mouth) harp/French harp, branch (creek), and shuck (corn husk).

While Wood makes no attempt to define his 'Plains Southern,' his discussion of the six items clearly indicates their possibility as South Texas items [Burlap sack/gunny sack (320, 348); comforter (322, 346); picket/paling fence (324); harmonica/mouth harp/harp/Jews harp/juice harp/French harp (337, 352, 352); stream/branch, bayou (342); corn shucks/husks (344)].

Five of the six items do, indeed, indicate 'Southwest' dialect presence. All ten informants gave 'creek' as the first choice for a small freshwater stream. When asked to give alternatives, and to rank them in size, the group more-or-less agreed to disagree--as Atwood predicted [Atwood, 39, 103]: 'brook (3), bayou (2), stream (3), ditch (1), slough (1), resaca (1)' were all given as smaller in size than 'creek.' When the informants were expected to agree, they did. Nine refer to 'shucks' as the covering on ears of corn; only one had 'husks.' All nine informants who had a word for a woven or nailed fence used 'picket.' Eight informants used 'bedspreads,' one a 'spread'; two gave 'counter pane' as alternative; the lone, seventeen-year-old maverick insisted on using a 'quilt' (but see Atwood, p.47, for the prediction that younger informants would use this term). Seven informants used Atwood's predicted 'harmonica' (189); five

used 'French harp,' which Atwood found all across Texas (67); the predicted Central and South Texas usage of 'mouth harp' (67) was used once by a bilingual informant--'musik de voca.'

The only vocabaulary disaster was 'crocker sack.' Atwood found a rather widespread usage of 'big burlap bag,' with an occasional usage of 'grass sack' (169). The ten LAGS informants produced only one 'burlap sack,' along with one 'cloth bag' and one 'flour sack.' The rest of the informants either recognized only 'sack' (five) or both 'sack' and 'bag' (two).

6.3 Pronunciation Variables

In 1985, I published a list of six pronunciation variables that distinguished the Southwest dialect from the "General Southern" and the "Prestige Southern" dialects of San Antonio (234-35). At the time, I was using terminology established by previous San Antonio language scholars (Atwood; Sawyer; Hamilton). As a set, the seven could be found in people who generally referred to the city as 'San Antone'--instead of 'San Antonio' (General) or 'San Tonya' (Prestige). The three dialects reflect a ranking, from lowest (Southwest) to highest (Prestige).

The ten LAGS informants add credence to four of the six variables. The [æə] sound in words like sack, bath, and hammer tends to have a strong nasalization [æ̃ə] or shwa off-glide [æə°]. Words like pin, pen or tin, ten or keg, and setting hen are uniformly pronounced like pin; or--just the oppposite--uniformly pronounced like pen. The word root is pronounced with the Midland [ʊʷ]; the LAGS informants were

studied for their pronouncation of roof, instead. Finally, the flapped [ɾ̆] sound in the word three was found in the speech of six of the ten informants--not as strong an endorsement as in the other three variables, but adequate documentation.

The two surprises were in the pronunciation of the final -ow in words like pillow and wheelbarrow--and in the palatalization of medial [u] in words like two and new suit. Instead of an unglided, Spanish [o] in pillow and wheelbarrow, the South Texas informants produced the Prestigous [ə]. And while four of the informants had the predicted palatalized [ju] in new; they all ten had the shorter dipthong [ʊu] in suit and two.

8. Closure

Two items should be addressed in closure.

First, I need to avoid overgeneralization. Urban sociolinguistic methodology needs to be applied to make sense out of these ideas suggested by the LAGS material. (For thirty-five variables, I should have a minimum of seventy informants, not ten. We could then determine how widespread the dialect might be.)

The LAGS interviewing techniques are faulty: 90 clear-cut responses out of 402 attempts is a dismal, twenty-two percent completion record. Cutting an eight-hour interview down to two hours is suspect--but so is the reverse; drawing out a two-hour interview to eight hours. These ten informants were interviewed by three different field workers and the transcriptions were written by six different scribes.

You will note no attempt on my part to display data on graphs or to give statistical percentages of responses. Drawing demographic correlations with ten South Texas informants will bring verifiable statistical results; but these statistical results would produce no valid insight into linguistic reality.

The second problem concerns the attempt to use the English language, Anglo-Saxon, rural biases of the LAGS data in a sometimes urban, sometimes Black, sometimes Hispanic environment. I see the same problem in urban sociolinguistic studies which are also ethically centered on one variety of English. When LAGS interviewers ask a Black, young, urban dweller to identify a hen sitting on some eggs (in the attempt to elicit 'setting hen' or 'brood hen'), and the informant answers 'rooster,' laughter is bound to result. But who is laughing at whom? And why?

I close with a sincere argument that we do use these LAGS data and use them wisely. If we can laugh at the researcher, we can begin to discover wise truths. A Black informant, for example, produced 'youngster' instead of 'children'; two of the Black speakers did not produce the Southwestern [æ] variants in words like bag; and two did not use the palatalized [ju].

Of relevance to the opening linguistic comments of this paper: the three Mexican-American bilingual speakers tended to not collapse the [i] and [e] pronunciations; were less consistent in the Southwestern variants of [æ]; used entirely different pronunciations for grease and greasy

(tending to prefer to [s] instead of [z] variants); and had the most difficulty with terms like bolster, dish rag, shucks, harmonica, burlap bag, picket fence, and stringing beads.

Wood justified his 1971 attempt to define the change from a basically English-less American vocabulary to an English-full one this way: "What we all need is a true chronology of the westward spread of American English;....(xi)" If we take that challenge seriously, the Atlas research, including the LAGS research, is truly full of insights. Among other information available to us, is the information about where the "westward spread of American English" stops--and where the "northern spread of Spanish" is still spreading.

If that is what is happening.

REFERENCES CITED

Allen, Harold B. 1973-76. The Linguistic Atlas of the Upper Midwest. 3 vols. (1973, 1975, 1976). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Atwood, E. Bagby. 1962. The Regional Vocabulary of Texas. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baird, Scott. 1984. "A Preliminary Look at the Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States Texas data." unpublished paper presented at the Rocky Mountain American Dialect Society meeting. El Paso, Texas.

_____. 1985. "English Dialects in San Antonio." Names 33:4, December, 232-242.

_____, and Annelise M. Duncan. 1985. "Variations in a German Dialect: Evidence from Tombstone Inscriptions." Papers from the Fifth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, H.J. Warkentyne (ed.). Victoria, British Columbia: University of Victoria

Carver, Craig M. 1986. American Regional Dialects: A Word Geography. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Davidson, James & John Batchelor. 1986. A History of the Republic: The United States to 1877 (Vol.1). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Davis, Lawrence M.. 1983. English Dialectology: An Introduction. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Eckerman, Jo & James C. McNutt. 1987. *San Antonio de* Bexar: *Its First Century of Growth and Development.* Texas Passages, 2:4, 4-8.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1985. The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity. Berlin: Mouton.

_____, (ed). 1970. Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague: Mouton.

Frazer, Timothy. 1987. *Review of Carver 1986.* American Speech, 69:2, summer, 154-159.

Hamilton, Wesley H. 1977. *Phonological Variations Observed in San Antonio, Texas.* The Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest. 11:3,4, December, 83-93

Hayakawa, Sen. S. I. (Honorary Chairman), John Tanton (Chairman), Gerda Bilkalas (Executive Director), Leo Sorensen (Founding Director), Stanley Diamond (Founding Director), Tom Kirby, Director. U.S. English.

Jones, Oakah L. 1987. "Comments." unpublished paper presented at the conference on The 18th Century Origins of the Tejano Community of San Antonio. October. San Antonio, Texas; The Institute of Texas Cultures.

Johnston, Leah. 1947. San Antonio St. Anthony's Town. San Antonio, Texas: Librarian Council.

Keyser, Samuel J. 1963. *Review of Kurath and McDavid 1961.* Language 39:303-316.

Kurath, Hans, et al. 1939-43. The Linguistic Atlas of New England. Providence, R.I.: Brown University

Malkiel. Y. 1984. *Revisionist dialectology and mainstream linguistics.* Language in Society. 13.1, March, 29-66.

Pederson, Lee. 1969. *The Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States: An Interim Report.* American Speech 44:4, 179-286.

_____. 1974a. *The Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States: Interim Report Two.* American Speech 49:3&4, 216-233.

_____. 1974b. *Tape/Text and Analogues.* American Speech 50:1&2, 5-24.

_____. 1976. *The Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States: Interim Report Three.* American Speech 51:3&4, 201-207.

_____. 1980. *Lexical Data from the Gulf States.* American Speech 55:3, 195-203.

_____. 1981. *The Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States: Interim Report Four.* American Speech 52:1, 1-13.

_____. 1986. The Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States: A Concordance of Basic Materials. Microform. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.

Pederson, Lee (editor), Susan Leas McDaniel (associate editor), Guy Bailey & Barvin Bassett (assistant editors), and Borden Dent (cartographer). 1986. Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States. Vol. One: Handbook. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

_____, et. al. 1981 The Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States. University Microforms International.

Sawyer, Janet. 1959. *Aloofness from Spanish Influence in Texas English.* Word, 15:2, 270-281.

Simpson, David. 1986. The Politics of American English, 1776-1850. Oxford: University Press.

Underwood, Gary N. 1976. *American English Dialectology: Alternatives for the Southwest.* International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 2:19-40.

Vierreck, Wolfgang. 1987. *Review of Pederson et al, 1986).* Journal of English Linguistics. 20:2, October, 255-257.

Wood, Gordon R. 1971. Vocabulary Change, A Study of Variation in Regional Words in Eight of the Southern States. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.